

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/008,757	RODRIGUEZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jerry A. Lorengo	1734

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jerry A. Lorengo. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Arthur Yeager. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 August 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-30.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

E/20/03
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Yeager was contacted by the examiner with regards to the election, with traverse, of claims 9-17. Having concluded that claims 9-17 were allowable over the prior art of record, the examiner attempted to acquire the authorization of Mr. Yeager to cancel non-elected claims 1-8 and 18-30 by examiner's amendment. Mr. Yeager, however, indicated that he would like to have the opportunity to formally traverse the restriction with written arguments. The examiner indicated that claims 9-17 would therefore be allowed under a Quayle action. Mr. Yeager acknowledged this fact.